



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

BRIEF MENTION.

The advance of conventionality, of regularity, is an old complaint. It is found everywhere in literature, everywhere in art. The decline of picturesqueness in the Paris of 1831 is the burden of Victor Hugo's *Notre Dame*. The day was coming, he said, when Paris from a bird's-eye-view would present a vision of 'ce je ne sais quoi de grandiose dans le simple et d'inattendu dans le beau, qui caractérise un damier'. And that was long before the invasion of the Osmanlis, as the Parisians of my youth called the minions of Haussmann. A few months ago a writer, who seemed to know Spain well, declared that the kerchief and jacket and sash that one looks for as the appropriate costume of the Spanish landlord of the interior, had given way to the London-made suit, and he was cruel enough to go into details and add verisimilitude to his statement by specifying a well-known tailor of Sackville Street, and the price £8. I myself have joined in the chorus and said that 'In the movement of modern life <the unworldly type of professor> is becoming less common even in Germany, once the habitat of intellectual oddities and unpractical dreamers. For this change the Empire may possibly be responsible, but certain it is that such a figure as Freytag's Professor Raschke in the "Verlorene Handschrift" will soon be as extinct as the dodo' (*Essays and Studies*, p. 128). But these words were written under the first impression of a visit to Germany (1880) after an interval of twenty years. Residence might have corrected the impression, and every now and then returning students tell stories about their German professors that make me less forlorn. But will there ever be another Franz Ritter with his strange pathetic utterance, his peculiar pronunciation, his queer way of getting his tongue twisted, his 'Manso's Vermisste Sriften', and his 'gelungener Lohndiener' instead of 'gedungener Tagelöhner'? A volume might be written about Ernst von Leutsch, who was not only a source of innocent merriment to others, but a well-spring of joy to himself, for which he seems to have got little credit. The Preface to his 'Grundriss zu Vorlesungen über die griechische Metrik' is highly characteristic of the man, and one shares his delight over the 'Klippen und scharfe Ecken' he had prepared for the 'fingerfertige Nichtkenner', who should undertake to get up a book out of his material. After Krüger passed away, the well-meaning Pökel ploughed up a lot of the torpedoes that were hidden in the old Krüger grammars and corrected texts which Krüger had distorted, or detorted, in order to blow up the smaller sex or hoist

unwary copyists. All dustmen are not as dry as the dust in which they deal. There are quotable bits in Lobeck and pawky parentheses in Veitch. The satire may be petrified satire, and the fun, cryptic fun, but who will begrudge the poor carver of gurgoyles the little joke that only the benevolent sky will see? It is a pleasure to put the diaphragm of a comma between two learned references. Remove the diaphragm and something like a mild explosion of merriment will ensue. But who removes diaphragms, who verifies references? In the long quest of passages that will not only illustrate, but also prove the points that are made, the weary way is often lighted up by the will o' the wisps of fun and fancy. Fix them and the jest is lost. There is a certain satisfaction in citing passages to prove one thing that have been steadily used to prove just the opposite. There is a certain satisfaction in citing an example that seems to contradict, and yet does not contradict the principle laid down. And yet there is danger in this, danger to one's reputation, as if that mattered. I have pointed the finger of scorn more than once at the sentimentalists who have attributed to Aristophanes a line which Aristophanes borrowed from Pindar (Eq. 1329), and I have been waiting for some critics to point out that Ar. Ran. 1152 (S. C. G. § 141) is a quotation from Aischylos, as if quotation and parody conveyed no lesson in syntax.

This is a portentously long introduction to an apology that I desire to make to the Manes of Professor Paley, assuredly a portentously long introduction for me because I am always ready to make amends without further ado. And yet a word more is necessary. In my S. C. G. § 193 I cite Eur. Phoen. 81: *ἔριν λύουσα*, as an illustration of the conative present participle. Why this passage above all others? Because Dindorf follows Valckenaer in reading *λύουσα* against the MSS and in foisting an un-Greek construction on Euripides. Nauck cites Valckenaer's 'emendation'. Later editors justly scorn to mention it but as long ago as 1859, Paley scented a solecism, as his commentary shows, though, to be sure, he had not the right vision of the phenomenon. Another illegitimate, though not so utterly illegitimate, future participle has crept into some texts of Euripides through a conjecture of Markland's, who wrote for the MS *θανούσαν* Eur. I. A. 1516 *ῥανοῦσαν*. Dindorf has adopted Markland's conjecture, and this is one of the points at which Mr. C. E. S. Headlam in his edition of 1889 forsakes the text of Kirchhoff, being as unappreciative of the character of the future participle as Dr. WALTER HEADLAM has since shewn himself to be (A. J. P. XXVIII 111). Now this limitation of the future participle is a very simple matter and very easily explained, on the theory that the future is originally modal, and that the future participle

is originally modal. The future infinitive may have been modal or it may have come in like the future optative to fill up the scheme of *oratio obliqua*, but the fut. participle is distinctly modal in Homer and is found only in the company of verbs of motion as Monro has duly emphasized (H. G. § 244). The future participle is never simply predictive except in ὥς with the future participle, the latest form of *oratio obliqua*, and after verbs of intellectual perception, which, however, from Homer on prefer the ἔτι construction. No conditional sense, no causal sense, no adversative sense, no genitive absolute, or at most with rare exceptions. And yet when the latest much lauded 'Go-cart for good little Grecians' counts up the usages of the participle, no hint is given of the coyness of the future participle as there is no explanation of ὥς οὖ.

Thirty years ago discussing ὥς οὖ with the participle (Just. Mart. Apol. I c. 4, 18), I urged as an argument against the conditional conception not only the neg. οὖ but the use of the future participle. I was cautious enough to say that it is not *regularly* used as the protasis of an abridged conditional sentence, and it was well that I was so cautious, for a correspondent sometime afterwards confronted me with Dem. 24, 189: μὴ περὶ τούτων ἡμῶν οἰσόντων (=εἰ μὴ οὔσετε) τὴν ψῆφον, τί δὲ ταῦτα λέγοντα ἐνοχλεῖν με νυνί; but everybody knows Demosthenes' love of περιβολή (A. J. P. IX 142), and this lonely example ought not to count in the face of the steadiness of the language in this regard.¹ A rare anarthrous future participle is found in Ar. Pax 756: κολάκων οἰμωξομένων, where Mazon has a note, but Sharpley and Van Leeuwen pass over it dry-shod. By the way, Van Leeuwen's syntactical notes are by no means up to the mark he has attained elsewhere as an interpreter of the mind of Aristophanes.

The eighteenth fascicle of the Schanz *Beiträge zur historischen Syntax der griechischen Sprache* (Würzburg, Stuber) deals with

¹ 'It may well be questioned whether another such example can be found in Greek' says Spieker, who after a diligent search in the orators, has found only two other genitives absolute with the fut. part. in the orators unaccompanied by ὥς (A. J. P. VI 325). 'It must never be forgotten', says an eminent physicist, 'that theories are only useful so long as they admit of the harmonious correlation of facts into a reasonable system. Directly a fact refuses to be pigeon-holed, and will not be explained on theoretic grounds, the theory must go or it must be revised to admit the new fact'. Now, a severe rule like this is hardly applicable to a thing so freakish as language, so feminine as language, of which we may say as Renan says of religions, '<Elles> sont des femmes dont il est très facile de tout obtenir, si on sait les prendre, impossible de rien obtenir, si on veut procéder de haute lutte'. An artist in language may make language do anything by coaxing. But there are those who do brutal violence to language and there is no Lynch-law to sweep the offenders and the offence out of the world of literature.

Die Kausalsätze im Griechischen bis Aristoteles I Die Poesie, and the author, MARTIN P. NILSSON, begins with a justification of the method pursued in these studies, a justification that is by no means superfluous. During the slow evolution of the *Beiträge* the syntactical basis has shifted a good deal. The whole elaborate structure is slipping into 'the deep channel of woe' βαθὺν ὄχρον ἄρας men call psychology, and the conjunctions, which used to serve as the markers of research, have been ruthlessly plucked up by students of linguistics like Professor Morris, whose advent on the syntactical field seems to have frightened so many of the old-fashioned investigators out of their propriety. In his *Principles and Methods* (p. 26), Professor Morris cites with approval from Probst the doctrine that the conjunction or particle acquires its meaning from the sentence, not the sentence from the conjunction, and NILSSON gives Morris the credit for this bold statement, which loses much of its boldness when one reflects that we call the same conjunction temporal, conditional, causal or adversative, according to the quicksand of the context, and that so thoughtful a grammarian as Lange found himself reduced to defining εἰ as an 'adhibitive' particle, a definition that would answer for any particle under the sun.

As my own investigations have dealt chiefly with the manners and customs, the social behavior of the language, have dealt with the Herakleitean ὥς rather than the Parmenidean ὅτι or else with the sophistic juggling of ὥς and ὅτι, my results, if I dare speak of results, have not been affected by recent developments, and I welcome every new theory in explanation of the phenomena as I do every new aspect of the Homeric Question. My life has not been long enough to answer a tithe of the questions I have asked myself as to the range and sphere of usage. The establishment of a catena is a laborious task, the problem of the missing link is often one that taxes the syntactical imagination, and the evaluation of the facts for stylistic purposes calls on all the resources of the 'Feinfühligkeit philologischen Nachempfindens', to use a happy phrase of the lamented Usener. Of course everybody is a psychologist nowadays. Indeed I myself have been accused of being a psychologist *malgré moi*, doubtless to the infinite amusement of the real psychologists, to whom I have opened wide the portals of the Journal. This being the state of things, it is not surprising that NILSSON finds it necessary to defend himself and the *Beiträge* generally by an introduction on the influence of logical needs on language, the introduction itself being introduced by a *captatio benevolentiae* addressed to the psychologists, to whom the great advance in the modern science of language is attributed.

The grammatical type, says NILSSON, has a psychological basis but logic intrudes; logic narrows the range of each type

and enriches its content. This is most clearly the case in literary language especially in prose, so largely subject to logical processes. Psychologically an absolute parataxis is very rare. The logical tendency is to subordinate one sentence to another. Hence the tendency to fix the relation by grammatical subordination. And as an instructive example of the victory of grammatical subordination NILSSON cites the much discussed δὲ ἀποδοτικόν in which psychological parataxis holds its own against grammatical hypotaxis. As soon as the grammatical type establishes itself firmly, δέ is felt as a coordinating conjunction, and disappears from the apodosis. This δὲ ἀποδοτικόν does not stand alone and NILSSON emphasizes the τε—καί use, the so-called *cum inversum* use in temporal sentences as Xen. An. 2, 1, 7: ἦδη τε ἦν περὶ πλῆθους ἀγορὰν καὶ ἔρχοντο κήρυκες. This is a favorite construction in naive or would-be naive narrative, and the tone is worth noting, but from my point of view, wherever we have correlation we have a manner of subordination, so that there is no use of discussing the fusion of parataxis and hypotaxis in sentences like these (A. J. P. XXIII 254).

The causal sentence is one of the most difficult subjects in the whole range of syntax, and I am not to be betrayed into a discussion of it in the narrow precincts of *Brief Mention* with the whistle of my steamer in my ear. The English language is a living monument of the slowness of the popular mind to clarify its conception of the causal nexus, and we have been fain to borrow our chief causal particle from the French. The inner object *that* (ὅτι), which is the native form, is still dominant with verbs of emotion but does not satisfy the causal feeling and *for that* is also unsatisfactory. The temporal sentence has a causal connotation but the nice distinction, once set up between 'sith' and 'since', does not hold. In Greek, as is well known, ἐπεὶ which corresponds to 'since', is the leading causal particle and it is to ἐπεὶ chiefly that NILSSON's paper is devoted, but I fail to see that he has made any use of Zycha's elaborate article on ἐπεὶ and the ἐπεὶ group in the Wiener Studien VII 82-115; and in his discussion of other temporal particles, used in a causal nexus, such as ὅτε and ὁπότε, NILSSON stops short of the generalization that all temporal particles with present and perfect indicative have, as a rule, a causal connotation, and among them particles of temporal limit, a point, which, like so many others, was hidden from the eyes of NILSSON's associate, Fuchs (S. C. G. § 366; A. J. P. IV 416; XXIV 389, 394, 400, 405; XXV 230). But the second part of NILSSON's treatise will give me an opportunity to discuss the whole subject more fully.

'Syntax and no end!' I hear the unsyntactical reader of *Brief Mention* say: 'No matter how a paragraph begins, it is sure to

bring up against a syntactical nostrum, very much like the advertisements of quack medicines that are inserted in the reading columns of a newspaper for the fooling of the unwary'. Now I am a sympathetic soul and, as Charles Lamb hissed his own farce of 'Mr. H.' in unison with the pit, so I am often at one with my critics and not unfrequently become so tired of other people's syntactical disquisitions that I am fain to renounce my own. But when Mr. CORNFORD speaks of his *Thucydides Mythistoricus* as an attempt to understand, not the syntax, but the mind, of Thucydides the syntactician in me revolts against this attitude of superiority. He who does not know the syntax of Thucydides does not know the mind of Thucydides. Syntax has been called the 'Parademarsch' of language, and we are all in the procession. He who sneers at the study of Thukydeian syntax fails to do justice to the conditions of Thukydeian thought. It might not be going too far to say that the two foci of the elliptical orbit of the great historian are points that fall within the range of syntactical study, the conception of causality and the domination of the abstract noun (A. J. P. XXIII 17). A well-known Homerist has written a noteworthy essay on 'Eine Schwäche der homerischen Denkart', and Mr. CORNFORD's book is an impugment of 'Eine Schwäche der thukydeischen Denkart'. The great historian, it seems, had not the same insight into the causes of the Peloponnesian war, as is possessed by Mr. CORNFORD, for the historian of to-day is largely concerned with economic causes. Corinth reaches forth, Athens reaches forth, both reach forth westward, the only open quarter. Conflicting interests bring about the struggle. There is nothing startlingly new about this. More than ten years ago in a study of the Peloponnesian War from the point of view of an old Confederate, I did not fail to draw the business parallel between the two conflicts (Atlantic Monthly, May, 1897), and the Peloponnesian line was represented thus :

'The famous Megarian decree of Perikles, which closed the market of Athens to Megarians gave rise to angry controversy, and the refusal to rescind that decree led to open war. But Megara was little more than a pretext. The subtle influence of Corinth was potent. The great merchant city of Greece dreaded the rise of Athens to dominant commercial importance and in the conflict between the Corinthian brass and the Attic clay the clay was shattered. Corinth does not show her hand much in the Peloponnesian war. She figures at the beginning and then disappears. But the old mole is at work the whole time, and what the Peloponnesians called the Attic war and the Attics the Peloponnesian war might have been called the Corinthian war.'

But economic causes do not explain everything. The final cause is the primal conception of causes. It is, if you choose, a 'Schwäche der menschlichen Denkart'. We cannot escape the emotional element, the personal element. The study of the Greek causal sentence which I have just put aside is an indispensable introduction to the study of the historian of the Peloponnesian war. Economic causes resolve themselves into *πλεονεξία* and *πλεονεξία* becomes an *αἷτια* and the famous Thukydeian *πρόφασις* is a surface

airía, but not merely a surface *airía*. There is a *μηῆς* in every struggle. The *airía* incorporates itself. To call it a policy does not clear up matters. Those who have lived *αἰσθανόμενοι τῇ ἡλικίᾳ* through a great war may be presumed to know more about such matters than cloistered speculators and can do justice to Homer with his Wrath of Achilles, to Herodotos with his Eternal Feminine, and to Thukydides with his Everlasting Abstract. For it is the abstract noun—not Perikles—that ‘lightens and thunders and makes a stir-about’ of Greek history—that semi-personification, in which the half is more potent than the whole, that abstract noun, which plays havoc with the critic as well as with him criticized (A. J. P. XVIII 368).

W. P. M: Students of Theocritus and Virgil will be interested in an excellent book by Mr. WALTER W. GREG, ‘Pastoral Poetry and Pastoral Drama’, xii+464 pp., London, 1906. The real subject of the work is the pastoral drama in Elizabethan literature, but a good deal of space is devoted to a preliminary account of European pastoralism in general. This preliminary account is probably the best critical study of the subject in English—a remark which one would like to emphasize in a brief notice which aims only at suggesting a few corrections and additions. The surprising statement occurs twice (pp. 5 and 13) that we owe the conception of the Golden Age to the Roman poets of the Augustan period. The conception is at least as old as Hesiod. It is misleading to say (p. 39) that Boccaccio’s *Ameto* “set a fashion in literature, namely the intermingling for purposes of narration of prose and verse”. Boccaccio may have consciously imitated the *De Consolatione Philosophiae* of Boethius, and the fashion itself was as old as the *Satira Menippea*. The statement (p. 62) that Marot’s greatest influence on Spenser is to be found in the November eclogue of the *Shepherd’s Calendar* might be modified after a careful comparison of the December eclogue with Marot’s *Éclogue au Roi*. It is unnecessary (p. 80) to allow Alexander Barclay any special credit for originality in his fifth eclogue. This is based on Mantuan’s sixth eclogue (with a passage borrowed from Mantuan’s seventh), and follows its Latin model quite as closely as any of the others.

Perhaps the weakest page in the volume is the one which is devoted to Calpurnius and Nemesianus. The seventh poem of Calpurnius can hardly be said to “contrast the life of the town with that of the country”. Even if it could, it is not worth saying that Calpurnius appears to have been the first to treat the direct comparison of the two. There is a direct comparison of the two toward the close of Virgil’s second *Georgic*. We are told, also, that it is not easy to trace any direct influence of these later bucolic poets. But at least one passage of Calpurnius (vi 32–45) is imitated in Sannazaro’s *Arcadia*, *prosa iv*. This is the proposal

to stake a pet stag on the result of a singing match. The animal may be identified by its collar, an ornament which it retains even when it passes on from the page of Sannazaro to Ronsard's first eclogue. Thus, Calpurnius has

ubi pendulus apri
Dens sedet et nivea distinguit pectora luna ;

Sannazaro adds another detail: "e quel monile, che hora gli vedi di marine conchiglie, con quel dente di Cinghiale, che à guisa d' una bianca Luna dinanzi al petto gli pende"; and the augmented description is faithfully reproduced in Ronsard:

D' un carquan enrichy de coquilles de mer,
D' ou pend la croche dent d' un sanglier, qui ressemble
En rondeur le croissant qui se rejoint ensemble.

A poem by Hieronymus Fracastorius, 'Alcon, sive de cura canum venaticorum', is clearly modeled upon Calpurnius, Bucol. V. One gets a different impression of the influence of Calpurnius and Nemesianus from Menéndez y Pelayo, *Orígenes de la Novela*, i 415: 'los imitaron en gran manera todos los bucólicos italianos y españoles del siglo xvi, comenzando por Sannazaro y acabando por Valbuena y Barahona de Soto.'

G. L. H.: Attention has been called to Professor C. H. Grandgent's admirable manual of *Provençal Phonology and Morphology* (A. J. Ph. XXVI, 364). His *Introduction to Vulgar Latin* (pp. XVIII, 220, D. C. Heath & Co., 1907), which appeals to a wider circle of scholars, can be equally commended. Mr. Grandgent's book is the first attempt to present as a whole a subject, of which the material is widely scattered, and the problems manifold. Certain phases of the subject have been exhaustively treated, and the results of these investigations are presented in a succinct form in their due places; and Mr. Grandgent is as careful to cite his authorities, as he is cautious in accepting their theses. Written especially for Romance students, the practice of noting the survival of Latin forms and constructions in the various Romance languages is another valuable feature of the book, and a detailed Table of Contents, and an Index of thirty pages, facilitates the use of the book for purposes of reference.

D. M. R.: The need which archaeologists have long felt for a complete history of the study of Greek inscriptions has been supplied by CHABERT, *Histoire sommaire des études d'épigraphie grecque* (Paris, Leroux, 1906), a reprint of a series of articles which have already appeared in the *Revue Archéologique*. The introduction discusses the peculiarities of Greek epigraphy, showing especially the superiority of stone originals over copied

manuscripts. Chapter I gives a survey of the oldest collections which preceded any idea of a *Corpus*, taking up first the ancient authors, Philochorus, Craterus, Polemo, Alcetas, Aristodemus, Neoptolemus, etc. After these men for over 1500 years there was silence and ignorance until Cyriac of Ancona (1391-1457) became the Schliemann of Greek epigraphy, and was followed by many others. Chapter II deals with the attempts of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries to form a collection of all Greek inscriptions; Chapter III with the *Corpus* of Boeckh, the *Expédition de Morée*, the work of Le Bas, Ross, Franz, etc. Chapter IV treats of the permanent archaeological institutions in Athens. In Chapters V and VI will be found in convenient form the new arrangement and numbering of the new *Corpus* (*Inscriptiones Graecae*) proposed by Wilamowitz in June, 1903, and since adopted by most scholars. Chapter VII (wrongly numbered VI), with the title *L'état des choses*, is devoted to publications and manuals, to excavations and explorations, and to the future of epigraphical studies. The hope is expressed that the *I. G.* may soon be completed, but with the loss of Von Prott, Benndorf, and Dittenberger, this can hardly be expected.

It is a pleasure to see how thoroughly acquainted Chabert is with the entire field of Greek epigraphy, and how impartial his treatment is. To be sure he speaks (p. 51) of the *pillages brutaux* of Lord Elgin, but Wilhelm, Sterrett and others are mentioned with the highest esteem. Chabert's knowledge of things American, however, is somewhat deficient. The first director of the American School of Classical Studies in Athens was not Prof. Waldstein (pp. 146-7), but Prof. Goodwin. Chabert has evidently not seen Prof. Seymour's Bulletin on the First Twenty Years of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, as he has the work of Radet on the French School, and that of Michaelis on the German School. Otherwise something would have been said about the American excavations at the Argive Heraeum, Eretria, Corinth, etc.

D. M. R.: A dramatic and popular account is given by TUCKER in his *Life in Ancient Athens* (Macmillan, 1906) of social and public life in Athens in the period of her greatest glory. There are chapters on Athens and its Environment; Public Buildings, Streets, etc.; Citizens, Outlanders, Slaves, Women; House and Furniture; The Social Day of a Typical Citizen; Woman's Life and Fashions; Boyhood.—Education and Training; Army and Navy; Religion; Festivals and the Theatre; Council and Assembly; An Athenian Trial; Burial; Athenian Art; Modernness of the Athenian. The eighty-five illustrations are from secondary sources, many from the plates used by Macmillan for Hill's Illustrations of School Classics. The book is of value to the general

reader, but disappointing to the student of Greek life and literature, because of its inaccuracies and meagre knowledge of Greek antiquities, and owing to the fact that Professor TUCKER has not acquainted himself with the standard works of Bauer, Blümner, Dörpfeld, Droysen, Giraud, and Fougères. Since Professor TUCKER aims to leave a true and sound impression of the period to which he limits himself (440 to 330 B. C.), a view (p. 33) of the Athenian acropolis as it appeared in the second century A. D. is out of place. In the fifth century the ascent to the acropolis was a winding path and not the marble flight of stairs as is stated p. 31 (cf. the restoration in Fougères Athènes, p. 34). A plan of a Delian house of the second century B. C. (p. 93) gives a wrong notion of a classical Greek house which had no peristyle. Due study of the latest research and of the houses of the fourth and third centuries B. C. excavated at Priene, the Greek Pompeii, would have furnished better examples and would have convinced Prof. Tucker that Greek houses were not built around more than one court (cf. pp. 91, 97). There is no evidence that "the Parthenon was apparently lighted by openings in the roof" (p. 37). A Greek temple was verily the house of God and not a meeting-place of a congregation, and received sufficient light through the large door, the light in Greece being very strong. Windows were rare, and only used where there were paintings, as in the Propylaea and Erechtheum. P. 48, the passage quoted is not from Dicaearchus, but probably from Heracleides of the second century B. C. P. 195, the statement about a leather garment worn from the waist and a corselet in two halves fails to recognise the difference between the metal corselet in two parts and the leather corselet with flaps at the bottom, consisting of one piece, the ends of which are brought together in front. In Chapter XII (pp. 227, 229, 232) Haigh's reasonless compromise between a high stage and no stage is adopted, but even in a popular handbook Dörpfeld should no longer be ignored. The Athenian theatre held not more than 17,000 spectators, certainly not 30,000 (p. 227). High-soled boots were probably not used by actors of the fifth and fourth centuries, as is stated, p. 235 (cf. Harvard Studies XVI, p. 123 f.). In Chapter XVI the Hermes of Praxiteles, busts of Pericles and Plato, and the Laocoon group (sic) are chosen to illustrate Athenian Art from 440 to 330 B. C. P. 290, the Attic-Ionic style of architecture is used to illustrate the Ionic.

D. M. R.: An excellent selection of 230 Greek inscriptions, taken mostly from Dittenberger, and dating from the seventh century B. C. to Roman imperial times, has been made by JANELL, *Ausgewählte Inschriften* (Berlin, Weidmann, 1906). The introduction deals with the use, material, content, form, language, alphabet, numerical signs, dialect, place of erection of inscriptions

and with epigraphical collections. No reference is made, however, to Cagnat, Reinach, Roberts, Hill's revised edition of Hicks' Historical Inscriptions or to the *Tituli Asiae Minoris* and Dr. JANELL (p. 5) does not know that the inscriptions of Delos (I. G. XI), as well as those of Delphi (I. G. VIII), will be published by the French. The first part contains documents from the public life of the Greeks arranged in chronological order and according to subject matter (dedications, oaths, decrees, treaties, letters, chronica, edicts, etc.) The second part, arranged according to material only, embraces notices from religious life (dedications, temple inventories, lists of priests; inscriptions concerning sacrifices, manumission and punishment of slaves, religious organizations, oracles, cures, curses; and grave-inscriptions). The omission of all signs for restorations and lacunae and changes from the text of the stones, and failure to keep the original spelling, will not conduce to accurate and scientific knowledge, which should be the aim even of a book meant for high-schools and laymen. A charming text binds together the inscriptions which are paralleled by German translations. Many modern terms, often not equivalents of the Greek, are used; cf. p. 29, *der oberste Priester* for *στεφανηφόρος*, p. 33 *das Amt eines Konsuls* for *προξενία*, p. 39 *Dukaten* for *χρυσούς*, p. 67 *Kammerherr* for *τῶν πρώτων φίλων*, *Jugendgespiele* for *σύντροφον*, *Oberscharfrichter* for *ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐγχειριδίου*, pp. 107, 108 *Chaiselongue* for *χαμεῖνα παράκολλος*, *Schlafrock* for *ἱμάτιον*, p. 118 *ungläubiger Thomas* for *Ἄπιστος*, p. 127 *Herzog* for *ἀρχηγέτας*. The verse-translations of the grave-inscriptions are fairly good, but the other translations are frequently inaccurate. The worst example is perhaps, p. 73, where *ἔδεισαν τὴν παρ' ὑμῖν ἐξετασίαν τῶν δούλων οἱ φεύγοντες τὴν δίκην* is rendered *die in den Prozess verwickelten Sklaven*, although the subject of *ἔδεισαν* is Eubouleus and Tryphera who are not slaves. There are also many inaccurate statements. To cite only one or two cases, p. 7 *Παρθένον* (who is Athena) is called Iphigenia. P. 12, "die Datierung auf den Monat wird durch die Prytanie gegeben". P. 93, the important epithet *Τιάμων* is omitted after *Μηνί*, and p. 145 Janell says it has not yet been explained, but cf. Harvard Studies VI, 68 f. P. 97 the idea is given that no. 125 (I. G. I, Suppl., p. 78, 334 a) is quoted by Herodotus V, 77. The inscription quoted by Herodotus will be found in I. G. I, p. 178, and Lolling, *Κατάλογος τοῦ ἐν Ἀθήναις ἐπιγραφικοῦ Μουσείου*, p. 66, no. 95. It is *stichedon* and the order of the couplets is the reverse of that in no. 125, which is the original inscription to be found also in the *Anthologia Lyrica*⁴, p. 266, no. (188). P. 117, note 3 JANELL places the scene of Aristophanes' *Plutus* in the Peiraeus. It is more probably in the Asclepieum which has been excavated on the southern slope of the Athenian acropolis. Most of the many misprints correct themselves, but Soundso (p. 19 for So und so) is a peculiar name for a *proxenos* and benefactor of Athens.